

The Committee of Inquiry met with Mr. John Anthony Brown Jr. at 9:30 a.m. June 25th for the purpose of getting his recollections of the circumstances leading to the selection of Dr. Elliott against the wishes of the Faculty Committee. Mr. Wood, Mr. Kraus and Mr. Davison were present.

Mr. Brown recounted the following:

The problem for him began on July 27, 1964 upon President Carroll's death when he returned from Brazil and called the Chairman of the Board and expressed his feelings. The Chairman replied that he had appointed Admiral Colclough Acting President and the Board of Trustees would confirm the appointment on the afternoon of President Carroll's funeral. This was in response to Mr. Brown's simple courteous statement, "If there is anything I can do to be helpful . . ." Mr. Brown thought he almost said "We do not need any help from you. We have taken this step." He responded by asking if they had cleared this with the Deans and the Executive Committee of the Senate because everyone knew that President was ill - and seriously ill - and that if Mr. Ellison had gone deeper into the matter, he would have seen the tremendous responsibility this placed on the Provost's shoulders. He stated he did not have to clear it with anyone. Since then, the Provost stated they told him within an hour of the time he arrived at the Stacy Place house.

The second statement Mr. Brown would make in this regard is that when the Faculty Committee was elected and the Board Committee selected, he was told by the Acting President at that time that there would not be joint meetings with these committees. Mr. Brown protested that this seemed to be wrong. He pointed out that the committees will not be looking for the same kind of man unless they understood each other. The Acting President said that Mr. Ellison would serve as liaison between the two committees.

When the search began, and the names were being considered, Mr. Brown thought it his business to quietly inform Mr. Ellison that he thought the decision to look outside and see who was available in the terms of reference which the two committees agreed to was a good one.

Q. Did the Board agree to this?

A. Mr. Brown assumed that out of that meeting would come understanding of the type of man they were looking for.

Q. You know about the criteria?

A. Yes.

Mr. Brown then stated that there was a long pause in which the committees heard little except rumors about Rusk, McNamara, etc. Mr. Brown said that as he had mentioned very early in this account that on some occasion, talking to Mr. Ellison, he had said, "Just so you know my position, I think your idea of seeing who is available from outside is commendable."

Mr. Brown said that when it got into the Fall, very shortly he began to hear rumors and even direct reports that he had organized a campaign to become President. Some of these came from strangers. Mr. Brown said that a Mr. Ellis White who is a sort of consultant and who finds executives for various types of situations (even University Presidents) called on Mr. Ellison to offer his services. He was told by Mr. Ellison that Mr. Brown had organized a campaign and he was being flooded with letters. He said that Mr. Ellison stated this as a fact. Mr. Brown believed this was in early December. Ellis White had his curiosity aroused by this. He is a friend of Theodore Disler. Mr. White talked to

Mr. Disler about this. Mr. White said that Mr. Ellison had a fixation about Mr. Brown. "He is almost incoherent about him." Mr. Disler told Mr. Brown he might just as well leave The George Washington University ~~as there was nowhere for him to go~~. Mr. Brown allowed Mr. Disler to put his name up for President of a new service being set up in educational research. Ironically, Mr. Brown said he was offered that position and was required to accept it on Friday, June 4, 1965. Mr. Ellison made all sorts of calls on people like Logan Wilson who gave Mr. Brown the same information that Mr. White had given him - that he had a campaign going.

Mr. Brown called on Mr. Ellison. He told him he knew he was saying this and that he deeply resented it. He asked him to give him any proof of his ever having sought anyone to write even one letter. Mr. Ellison agreed with Mr. Brown and said the number of letters received had grown so large that he knew Mr. Brown could not have done this. Mr. Brown told him he would say no more about it, but that he would be back if he heard about it again.

Mr. Ellison asked about the President's health. He (Mr. Ellison) remarked that a President must be selected by the June meeting of the Board. He said people had been telling him things which Mr. Brown had been saying. He said Mr. Brown would not be considered until the outside search had been given up. Mr. Brown said he only went to see him about having started a campaign.

By that time several outside people had been interviewed. Mr. Brown was indignant about the part he was given in these interviews. At the first meeting with a candidate, Mr. Brown was asked to go in the President's limousine around the campus. He said it was like giving a guided tour. "This is Lisner, this is the School of Government, this is so and so." Mr. Brown expressed himself strongly to President Colclough that this was absolutely ridiculous. While he (Mr. Brown) did not always agree with President Carroll, he liked him. President Carroll had told Mr. Brown that he had been misled about the problems at this University. The same situation will happen again if these people (candidates) are not shown the facilities.

with

(Mr. Brown spoke off the record about his cordial relations/the
the Carrolls)

Mr. Brown said that the procedure in these cases was to take the candidate and ride him around the campus, then Mr. Herzog and Mr. Brown met him for half an hour and then they came and met the deans. Mr. Brown thought this was absolutely absurd. Nothing transpired in that period of time. It was a series of social visits, with a few remarks that we had students from foreign countries and that the University had operated in the black for thirty years.

It was at this time that President Colclough and Mr. Brown had the only real clash they ever had. He really shouted at Mr. Brown and Mr. Brown in turn got very exercised and shouted back that he should take the tour next time as he (Mr. Brown) would invite them into the places. He followed the suggestion, and never invited Mr. Brown to go again.

As the search moved along, they came to the interview with Courtland Perkins. Mr. Brown had six minutes with Mr. Perkins and he aroused his interest in these six minutes, and Mr. Brown decided to go with him over to the Deans and listen. He had asked the right questions in the six minutes and had really aroused Mr. Brown's curiosity. Mr. Brown made it his business to say that he would like to take Mr. Perkins over to the Deans and stay a while. "No, indeed", he said (the secretary thinks this refers to President Colclough). After the interview with Perkins, Mr. Brown was approached by a member of the Faculty Committee who asked him his reactions and he said that he had not had time to make up his mind in six minutes. He said that Mr. Perkins had made one statement which alarmed him about being in the midst of all the money in the world. Mr. Brown was asked if he could work with Mr. Perkins and Mr. Brown replied he did not know but he was inclined to try, if he wanted him to.

Shortly after this, (the dates were available but Mr. Brown did not have them with him) the Faculty Committee asked him to come as a candidate as they were interviewing other people. He did that. Not all of the committee were present, but it was a good evening. He had an opportunity to explain some of the problems and suggest some solution to them.

Q. Do you know if anyone on the Faculty Committee had seen the Dean's report?

A. Mr. Brown said he did not believe anyone had by that time. He could almost state that as a fact because he referred to this planning and this report and the Chairman indicated he would like to have a copy of the report. Mr. Brown's mission was to try to get this academic long-range plan to the Board of Trustees. He believed then and still believes it lays a positive course for the University.

(Professor Davison said the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Board were very anxious to read it.)

Mr. Brown said he knows why they do not have it. The fact is that the Acting President said that what should happen to this report is that it should be buried. Mr. Brown said that the committee could ask any dean who was present at the Academic Policy meeting to verify his statement that the thing that should be done with it is to bury it.

Q. Did President Colclough explain his reasons for this statement?

A. No, he did with Mr. Brown but not with the deans. Dean Mason asked what was going to be done with the report? Is it going to be given to the full Board of Trustees, and the President said he hoped it was buried. The report was submitted to the Chairman, Academic Policy Committee of the Board, Mr. Carmichael for his committee. He never distributed these copies. Mr. Brown was invited to this committee and the committee meeting consisted of Mr. Carmichael, Mr. Ellison and himself. It became clear that the report was not going to get into the hands of the trustees and it has not. Unofficially, it has not. Once Mr. Brown found out that Mr. Carmichael did not give copies to his committee, Mr. Brown felt the responsibility to see that they had these copies. As we got deeper into the Spring there was considerable consternation on the part of the people interviewing candidates because of the disparity and variety of people coming through. There seemed to be no common denominator. There was a man from Berkely (Duprés) who had very little experience and didn't want to get any. We had had a tentative agreement to have him as a history professor but he didn't become one. Wood Gray did not say why. Then came John Wilson of the National Science Foundation who said the position required someone who would get more money than he knew how to get and requested the Faculty Committee not to take him seriously. This sequence of heterogeneous people began to have an impact on the deans because they are worried about their schools. Several of the deans are deeply disturbed. They feel there is a crisis in their schools. Dean Mason fears the Engineering School will lose its accreditation in 1967. Dean Linton feels the same way. Dean Parks has an even worse problem and that is his own statement. That School will be surveyed and drastic action will be taken.

The deans began to be dismayed when wherever they went Mr. Ellison offered people the Presidency. Mr. Brown said he doubted he really offered them the presidency but many people thought they had been offered it. Bailey of Syracuse, Allan Carter of the American Council both talked to people here. Carter to Brown and ~~Mr. Brown~~ ^{Mr. Brown} Many said that (either ~~the Provost or Mr. Ellison~~ ^{Mr. Brown}) kept pounding the desk and saying the University is in the black. It just need a man to be its President. This is the "Marvin concept" held by the people on the Board.

By early May, we had come down to a position where Perkins, offered the job, said he would not take it. Mr. Ransom was next. Mr. Brown was very impressed with Ransom. He was the first one he joined the deans in approving. Mr. Brown was proud of the deans and of him. He stated he would not allow his name to be on the list for more than 10 days unless he could meet with the Faculty Committee. He answered the questions intelligently. There was reluctance to get in touch with him because they might stir up the rumor in Texas

that he was leaving.

Q. What about Dave Green of the Law School. He saw him. Had him as his dinner guest?

A. I know nothing about that.

Mr. Brown called Mr. Ellison and stated that he thought this man was outstanding and if he could be secured, he thought he was fine and if he wanted to work with Mr. Brown, he could. Mr. Brown told Mr. Ellison, he was very impressed. Mr. Ellison wanted to keep on talking. Two or three times he thanked him for having done this.

Ransom wrote a letter to the Faculty Committee which was looked on as a stupid letter in which he heaped praise on the President and Chairman of the Board for what they had done.

Mr. Brown spoke to Stevens, LeBlanc and Walker. He knew they did not want to interview him (Ransom). They thought he talked too much, etc. Mr. Brown said Texans talk like that. He has brought a lot of money to Texas so go ahead and interview him. We then learned that Mr. Ransom was out of the picture. Mr. Brown thought he was toying with this position to impress his own Board of Trustees. President Colclough read a telegram from him to the deans.

Q. What about the ~~letter~~ ^{call} from Airlie House?

A. John Paul Carter knew him (Ransom) very well. They were close personal friends. During the Assembly at Airlie, Carter picked up from the Deans the extent of enthusiastic support for him that had developed. Whether he called or not, Mr. Brown did not know. It was after Ransom had withdrawn in any case. Mr. Brown had indicated to the Faculty Committee and the Deans that he would be delighted to work with him.

Following that information, they had information that Dr. Elliott was coming. Dr. Elliott arrived on the 28th of May for an interview.

Q. Do you know when he was first contacted?

A. Mr. Brown would think two or three weeks prior to that.

Mr. Elliott came. Mr. Brown said he could not be too dramatic in his language to describe the impact. The interview was embarrassing. Mr. Brown joined all the Deans. Dr. Elliott showed no understanding about the University at all. What were its strengths and weakness. He knew nothing about other institutions in Washington at all. It was closer to being a rude meeting. He had come to us with no prior information about the institution. "My present idea is that he was ~~approved~~ ^{briefed} by Mr. Hughes."

(Mr. Brown then read a letter he had written to Acting President Colclough about Mr. Elliott dated May 28, 1965. (See copy attached.)

Following that meeting, the deans became close to despair or panic that they were interviewing a man on this level. Mr. Brown said they could have had meetings every night. It was following this that they got together and signed the statement that ~~it was~~ ^{Mr. Brown's qualifications were} ~~superior to Colclough's~~ ^{Elliot's} (in the frame of reaction to the interview with Elliott.) There were two deans who had never endorsed Mr. Brown at all. Deans Hamblin and Mason. Even Mr. Hamblin signed the letter.

The first letter was anticipatory to his arrival. When the first statement had been prepared, Arthur Burns came in with a copy of a letter and stated it was going to be released to all members of the Board of Trustees. I am sure Dean Burns will confirm that I said it should be taken to Mr. Ellison (Mr. Brown stated).

(Here Professor Davison described ~~Dean Hamblin's~~ ^{the reported} visit ^{gone of the Deans} to the Acting President after

this meeting)

The fact that the statement was signed by the Chairman and several deans and not by Hamblin, Mason, Mayo and Kramer was why, at Mr. Brown's instigation, it was not mailed to all the members of the Board of Trustees.

Following Mr. Elliott's visit and his endorsement, Mr. Brown became really upset, because he really felt Mr. Elliott was not the right man. He felt that his name had been urged on the University by one New York foundation. Then about May 28, he became personally involved. He called his friend at the Ford Foundation (James Armsley) whom he knew very well. He told him the morale of the institution was "gone to hell" because we have just interviewed a man who is not qualified in any way to be President and I had been told someone at the Ford Foundation had urged him upon us. He said this was not the case. He said they did not know Elliott. We don't recommend or urge anybody. The most they did was to give a list of people. He said Mr. Ellison had been there (to the Ford Foundation) again and again and again and they had given him names and never recommended a name to him because _____

He called the Rockefeller Foundation, the name did not come from them. Mr. Brown got exactly the same story. They were asked every day by the Trustees to give them names and were reluctant because if they gave a name, they expected money from the Foundation if the man were selected. When Newell Ellison came to Mr. Logan Wilson, he gave him Mr. Brown's name and Mr. Ellison pointed his finger at Mr. Wilson and said, "He is out!" This was early in the fall of 1964, ~~Tom Brown talked to Logan Wilson and got the same story I got. Harold Bright saw this. I pointed out how dangerous it is to give out names.~~

Q. Some people have described Mr. Ellison as a "nice old man". What is your impression?

A. The impression Mr. Ellison gives is of a rather charming old gentleman who is very distressed by this problem. "He was spending 70% of his time on this search and how difficult it was." He talked to Allan Carter about salary & \$45,000. He had given him the story about how we were "in the black;" and he talked to Douglas Kader (?) at the White House; and he had John Corson to lunch and begged him to let his name be presented to the Board ~~on the 5th of June. He said he was in the position of being Chairman of the Board of the Corporation and asked him to be President.~~ *about ten days before Ellison was elected*

The thing that Elliott does not know is that down to June 5, Mr. Ellison was still asking people to be on the list - Babbidge and John Corson were interviewed right down to June 5, 1965.

Allan Carter told me with considerable contempt (my loyalty to the University is such that I was upset by his attitude) about how Mr. Ellison describes how we have been able to buy real estate and all sorts of things that we were able to do with the money. *because we were in the black,*

Q. On May 20th, the members of the Board met with four people to discuss people who might be interviewed for President or Acting President?

A. Yes, they met me in the morning and met Charles Nutting and *needed* Crawford in the afternoon.

Q. The Board meets with only half of its members?

A. In the interview with me, Mrs. Graham, Mr. Ellison, Admiral Straus (and two others) were present (The secretary did not hear the names of the two others). This was just perfunctory. We have to do this to keep the record clear. ~~This was it.~~ Mrs. Graham asked some good questions. They opened the door to let me say some of the

things about University conditions and what we should do to improve them. Straus did not say a word through the whole interview. Mr. McKee made several remarks when I talked about a massive building program. I did not take the interview seriously. ~~It was for the Acting Presidency.~~

In the last ten days there was a flood of information such as Professor Kraus got from Allen Carter. People called to say we needed more names, and I became convinced that serious fundamental harm to our University was being done.

Q. Did you have the feeling that Mr. Ellison was not a well man in the last weeks or months.

A. I do not believe that I noticed it

In December, Mr. Ellison went to Harvard Graduate Business School and said he wanted to see someone who was ~~there~~ when Tom Carroll was there. He met Les Rawlins and asked him for names. Les told Mr. Brown about Mr. Ellison's not wanting anything to do with Mr. Brown's name. Mr. Brown was more concerned about his attitude in getting names than about his adamant feeling toward Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown said it was tragic. (Mr. Rawlins said he (?) was one of the farthest out intellectuals we have here. He told about a professor who came down here and went around the campus)

(The secretary did not appear to get the reference in the statement in parenthesis above.)

Mr. Brown said it seemed crystal clear to him that the Faculty Committee was looking for one kind of man who could give leadership of the sort which would get the University moving. The Trustees evidently feel there is no need to raise large sums of money.

In response to a question about student reactions to Mr. Brown's candidacy, Mr. Brown said that Mr. Gnaeme told him the Student Council wanted to pass a resolution to endorse him as President, or have a mass meeting, or anything else it could do before vacation time started. Mr. Brown said, "No, this is not the way a University elects a president." He told Mr. Gnaeme to go quietly to Mr. Ellison by himself. He went and came back and told Mr. Brown that Mr. Ellison could not be moved. He said ~~he~~ was unalterably opposed to Mr. Brown.

(There was a general discussion about when Dr. Elliott arrives which was declared not pertinent to Mr. Brown's statement)

Mr. Brown stated in conclusion that he was not bitter, he was shocked *at the way the search had been conducted.*

(There was a general discussion here which was declared not a part of Mr. Brown's statement concerning ~~a T-Committee~~ *the* investigation.)

*Copy of this letter was given
to the Committee by Mr. Brown
for its information on
June 25 at interview.
Original copy was returned
to Mr. Brown for his own
file.*

May 28, 1965

To: Acting President Colclough
From: John Anthony Brown, Jr.

In response to your request this morning that you would like to be able to convey to the trustees our impression of Mr. Elliott, who was our guest from Maine today, I give you a brief statement of my views.

It quickly became apparent that Mr. Elliott had come to us without making any significant effort to learn the basic facts which are readily available from standard publications about our institution. The questions he asked and the answers he gave led me to believe he is not fully acquainted with the problems of private, urban universities.

Although I left the interview after 45 minutes has transpired, I felt that there was not the same strength of leadership in this man that we found in at least two other visitors. He did not have the articulate capacity to discuss problems of higher education or pose good questions about higher education that one looks for, and that his own education, which seems to be rather restricted to institutions which were not in large cities, provides him with a heavy handicap in understanding our kind of institution.

These are candid and hurried remarks, given to you for whatever use you care to make of them. I have not discussed Mr. Elliott with my colleagues, nor do I intend to.

John Anthony Brown, Jr.

(Dictated but not read)

The Inquiry Committee met at 12:30 p.m., Thursday, June 24, 1965 to hear the recollections of Mr. Hugh LeBlanc and Mr. Edwin Stevens in the matter of the Selection of a President by the Board of Trustees against the recommendations of the Faculty Committee. Professors Reuben Wood, Wolfgang Kraus and J. Forrester Davison were present.

Q. Do you wish to give us your version of the matter?

A. Mr. Stevens said he had nothing to say beyond what had already been said. He was here, however, to answer any questions that might be asked of him.

Q. Have you found any important factors in your files?

A. Dr. Brown asked Stevens and Schmidt to prepare the final report of the Faculty Committee. Mr. Stevens and Mr. Schmidt were going to try to "true up" this information in the report. First they checked the documents to see what took place when. They did not isolate things. Sometimes they had a document for it, sometimes they did not. They had no records of their meetings in the early interim and so they checked with Mrs. Russo in the Faculty Club to see when they had shown up for a committee meeting. They were preparing just a short ~~and~~ chronology of events.

Q. Mr. Morris and Mr. Phillips spoke highly of Ellison, the Board of Trustees, etc. What was your reaction to the energy that was shown by their committee?

A. Mr. Stevens said he did get the feeling that the Trustees Committee were a good bit longer than the Faculty Committee in drawing up their select list. The Faculty Committee list was published and sent to them. Theirs did not come along until a month or so later.

Dean Rusk and McNamara were being considered by them. The attitude seemed to be that the Trustees knew what was good for the Faculty. The Faculty would just be expected to give a rubber stamp to them. They were just waiting for the decision to be made.

Mr. LeBlanc said some other departmental secretaries such as Mr. Willard Wirtz were on their list but the names of McNamara and Rusk never appeared, but at their first meeting, Mr. Ellison made it very clear that the responsibility of the presidency lay with the Board. It was made very clear at the first meeting.

Q. Did you announce the criteria at this meeting? How did the Trustees react to these?

A. We sent the criteria in the letter of September 24.

Q. Did they have any order of rank?

A. Miller, Stevens and Walker worked on wording the original set of criteria. Mr. Stevens said they were listed in Interim Report #1 but not in order of priority.

Q. Is there any reason why there was no effort made to get any kind of commitment on these criteria from the Board Committee?

A. Mr. LeBlanc said the Faculty Committee thought of them as being on the broadest possible lines to suggest what they were looking for. Anyone could have fit the criteria, if one so desired.

Q. Would it not have been preferable than not having anything to go on (to have them approved by the Board Committee.)

A. We felt results could be better obtained by looking at the candidates and using them as bench marks, Mr. LeBlanc stated.

Q. Some believe that your Committee feels betrayed. What were you doing to work with the Trustees Committee?

A. Mr. LeBlanc said he believed they were working independently.

Q. Was there any question about whether the Trustees' choice would be acceptable to your Committee?

A. Mr. Stevens said he would have to say, "No". There were no orderly procedures by which the two committees could work.

Mr. LeBlanc said the Faculty Committee did not know what the Trustees Committee was doing. We worked independently. We did not know whom they were interviewing.

Q. It seems to me that there might well have been something that might have been done to lead to some working plan between the two committees being set up.

A. Our answer was the Blue Book for the Proper Approach in Selecting a President. This was sent, or they thought it was, to the Board of Trustees by Arthur Miller.

Mr. LeBlanc said Dr. Brown handled things in what might have seemed to be an unusual manner at times. When the Committee wrote its first report which was critical of the relations between the Board and the Faculty Committees, Dr. Brown wanted to avoid any possibility of a "wrangle" in the Faculty Committee. Everyone in the Committee said "Don't push him." Dr. Brown's approach was a carrot and stick affair to show them we would act in good faith. Just give us a chance to help you. But the Committee did not feel this way. (There was a reference here to a document dated February 17, 1965 and its second paragraph - Interim Report #2)

Q. Did they have anyone else in charge of the Committee other than Mr. Ellison?

A. Mr. Stevens said there was no Vice Chairman, so far as he knew.

Q. How many members of their Committee actually met with your Committee?

A. At the first meeting in October, Mr. Stevens recalled that Mr. Ellison, Mr. McKee, Mr. Carleton Smith, Mr. Carmichael and Mr. Buchanan were present. (It was the day of Herbert Hoover's funeral and McElway, Graham and Strauss were unable to be present because of the funeral and a commitment to travel with Mr. Goldwater after the funeral.

Q. Did anyone really participate in these meetings other than Mr. Ellison.

A. Mr. McKee did. He thought that maybe they could get someone from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, after Goldwater was elected (such as Johnson, etc.).

At the second meeting which occurred some time in February, they recalled that Mrs. Graham, Mr. Hughes and Mr. Poynter were present.

Q. If we were to invite a member of the Trustees Committee to speak with us, whom would you suggest?

A. Mr. LeBlanc would suggest Mrs. Graham.

The following statements were then made:

At the first meeting we got Ellison's and the Trustees' Committee's permission to visit the campus about Weaver and report back.

J. Perkins' name came up at a meeting with Mr. Ellison.

The Faculty Committee met with Mr. Ellison several times along the way either in Dr. Brown's office or at lunch.

Mr. Stevens stated J. Perkins was on their list. He (Mr. Ellison) thought highly of him. The one who opposed J. Perkins was Carol St. Cyr. We had an interview with Professor Purcell who was up there before he came here. After this, we all opposed J. Perkins. Mr. Ellison was amazed at our reactions to Mr. Perkins.

Q. Did he express the opinion that J. Perkins was still a good man?

A. He contradicted Carol St. Cyr that he had been turned down by several universities, and then she named the four universities. Mr. Ellison was shocked.

Q. Did Mr. Ellison ever say that the Board would not press a candidate not approved by the Faculty?

A. Mr. Stevens said he never heard him do so. Mr. LeBlanc said when the Committee had made its report on Courtland Perkins and Ransom, Mr. Hughes said that weight should be given to the Faculty's point of view.

Q. It would be fair to say that the relationship between the two committees was much like the kind of communication the Faculty has through the President to the Board of Trustees?

A. Mr. LeBlanc said they were thinking about the problem every minute, asking Dr. Tom Brown to call him on the phone, and Ellison saying there was nothing to discuss. The question seemed to always be how far could you push Ellison.

Q. Did you think Ellison might want to consider people the Faculty wanted?

A. Mr. Stevens said on our list eight or nine had indicated they were not interested in the job. It was a question of boiling down to the fact that only these people were left.

Q. Your people never met Ransom?

A. No. Mr. Stevens said they were specifically asked by Ellison not to check Ransom on his own campus because of some problems in Texas.

Mr. Schmidt called up someone in the Chemistry Department at Texas but this was before the lid had been put on.

(There was discussion here about the call made to Ransom from Airlie House and it was said to have been placed by a man who works with Mr. Murdock Head, who had been a chaplain at Texas and knew Ransom to encourage him to come.)

(There was a further discussion of a letter to Ransom from Professor David Crittendon Green in the Law School who also knew, or was thought to know, Mr. Ransom personally)

Mr. Stevens said everyone apparently knew more about Ransom than the Committee did. Mr. LeBlanc said they all went to people in their departments where they thought people had contacts that they did not have. Mr. Miller made these available to the Committee.

(There was a comment here about the present committee not having any right to the file of the Special Committee in the opinion of Dean Kayser)

Mr. Stevens said his own feelings were that the documents should be turned over to this committee since it had been appointed by the Faculty although there are a lot of confidential documents in the file.

Q. Does anyone know how the second letter from Courtland Perkins got into the newspapers?

A. Mr. Stevens said the only information he had was that Dr. Tom Brown read the letter to the departmental chairmen and deans. Some members of the Committee were quite irked that he did this. The letter was addressed to Miller from Perkins.

Q. Mr. Miller wrote to Perkins?

A. Mr. LeBlanc said the Committee authorized Miller to write the letter.

Mr. Kraus mentioned that when this letter was read to the deans and chairmen there were many young men whom he did not know and had never seen before present. This created some uncertainty.

Q. Ransom never replied to the final letter, Ellison stated?

A. Stevens said "Yes". Arthur (Miller) got in touch with Ransom and he pointed out he could document this.

Stevens telephoned Ellison on the evening of May 7 and asked him if there was a letter to Colclough from Ransom refusing the appointment. Ellison indicated there was and that therefore he had authorized Hughes to go to see Elliott. He said if Perkins and Ransom were turned down there would be another meeting before anyone else should be considered. There is a letter to this effect. (See Arthur Miller's record of the Joint Meeting.) Joe Hughes said there should be a joint meeting if Perkins turned us down.

Ellison dispatched Hughes to see Elliott before any joint meeting was called.

Mr. LeBlanc said he recalled that at the third meeting, Mr. Ellison, Mrs. Graham and Mr. McKelway were present. They were worried about information getting into the Hatchet. To place the date of this meeting, Mr. Stevens said it was the Wednesday before the last Tuesday the Hatchet was published before the summer session. At this time the list was composed of Dr. Elliott, Dr. Coles and Mr. J. A. Brown.

Q. The Committee has information that three people were interviewed in the last two weeks. Mr. Carter, Mr. Babbidge and Mr. Corson.

A. Mr. Stevens had a conversation in the evening with Mr. Ellison on May 7 and asked him if the list were open again on this. He said yes.

Q. Do you have the date of the first meeting of the Deans?

A. Yes, it was May 7.

Q. Do you think Mr. Ellison had any idea of this meeting at that time and that he then sent Mr. Hughes to New York to interview Dr. Elliott?

A. Stevens said he felt Ellison did know of the Dean's meeting.

(Here there was a review of the meeting of Dean Linton)

Q. Mr. Davison stated again "Note the date of May 7 in dispatching Hughes to New York on the same date the President received a communication about the Deans meeting at that time."

(There was a statement here that at some meeting around the same time, Deans Nutting and Van Evera, and Meredith Crawford and J. A. Brown were all interviewed.) (This concerns "internalizing the search.")

Q. Was it ever communicated to you as members of the Special Faculty Committee that you would be welcome at this meeting (Meeting of the Deans and Chairmen.)

A. Yes

Q. Did you have a vote of confidence in the Chairman of the Special Committee (Dr. Brown) after the Dean's meeting (which he attended as Chairman of the Department of Medicine.)

A. I would not call it a "vote of confidence" in the sense that Dr. Brown needed a vote to sustain his position as Chairman. We thought he had done an outstanding job despite the fact that some members felt he had not been wise to attend the dean's meeting.

Q. Do you think the letter from the Deans and Chairmen was designed to undercut your committee?

A. Mr. Stevens said he thought all groups on campus should express their views.

Q. The Deans and Chairmen and other members of the Faculty were all expressing opinions. Do you think this should have been handled as the business of the Special Faculty Committee?

A. Mr. Stevens said his own reaction was that the Faculty Committee was no longer reflecting the opinions of the entire Faculty. His file bulged with requests that the Committee work for the candidacy of Mr. J. A. Brown.

Q. Were you aware that not only you (the Special Committee) but other people of the Administrative staff, the Trustees Committee and the Trustees themselves were receiving long distance calls etc. all soliciting their support for Mr. J. A. Brown?

A. Mr. Stevens said he knew there was a campaign but how extensive he didn't know because no one ever talked about it to him.

Q. What was the motivation for this campaign? Was it that the Faculty no longer had faith in the Faculty Selection Committee and all sorts of "supra-committees" had formed all around, or was it that President Colclough tended to "hold the line" and make no changes?

A. Mr. Stevens said he heard the latter reason give for some of the letters, and the former reason for others.

Q. Have you ever heard anything about the manner in which Mr. J. A. Brown was made Dean of Faculties?

A. Mr. Stevens said only by rumors.

(Professor Davison then outlined the circumstances surrounding this appointment.)

The statement was made here that rumor stated that Carroll said he would resign if J. A. Brown did not get the appointment.

Mr. LeBlanc said Mr. Ellison mentioned the Dean of Faculties appointment. He was somewhat disturbed over the manner in which he had been made Dean of Faculties. Mr. LeBlanc said he wondered if this was Mr. J. A. Brown's fault or Dr. Carroll's.

Q. On some occasions Mr. Ellison became quite emotionally involved about certain facets of the search. We have heard this opinion stated?

A. Mr. Stevens and Mr. LeBlanc recalled that Mr. Ellison had become quite excited about some of the language in Interim Report #2, specifically the last paragraph on page two.

He also became quite agitated during the J. Perkins candidacy when he told Dr. St. Cyr she was wrong in her statements.

Mr. Stevens said he had raised the question in the meeting on April 12 if Ransom and Perkins both turned down the offer, would John A. Brown then be acceptable. On May 12, when they were down to Coles and Elliott, he raised the same question. Mr. Ellison said the good Lord might see fit to send someone else. When Mr. Stevens persisted along this line, Mr. Ellison pointed his finger at him and told him, "Don't push me."

Q. When you knew of this hostility, what led you to still propose John A. Brown be considered late in May?

A. Our list then included J. A. Brown, Coles and Elliott in alphabetical order. When Dr. Coles was out, they thought it was then between J. A. Brown and Elliott. Mr. LeBlanc said at this meeting that Carmichael defended Coles but the Trustees Committee appeared more interested in Elliott. Mr. LeBlanc said Mr. Ellison never stated that Mr. J. A. Brown was out of the running but always indicated he did not think he was ready for the presidency. He was fine where he was, etc. but Mr. Stevens felt that if it came down to a choice between the two men, the one with "internal" experience would be the choice.

Mr. Stevens said he wondered whether Mr. Ellison was accurately and fully transmitting the information he gained from the Faculty Committee to the Board Committee.

Q. There is some criticism of your committee for not having itself developed more candidates. We know your Committee worked tremendously hard. But if you had developed some others would it perhaps not be likely to come down to a case of "We do not like Elliott, we like Brown"?

A. Walker, LeBlanc and Stevens felt that unavailability of other candidates indicated we were not likely to get anyone as good as J. A. Brown. It would be better to take J. A. Brown than just anyone.

Another statement was made here by LeBlanc that "If Elliott's name had come up months ago, we would not have looked at him twice."

Mr. Stevens said that the Committee felt on the basis of the May 12 Meeting that their conditions for good conscience were satisfied. At this meeting we understood that they would elect the man they would recommend before June 5, and would consult with us. I just did not believe our Committee would recommend Elliott or Coles. (The Deans and Chairman are quite optimistic.)

Some general discussion then ensued which was considered not a part of this record and Mr. Stevens submitted a copy of a resolution which he suggested might be considered for proposal at the next faculty assembly meeting and which is attached.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm approximately.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

I. President

The Faculty Assembly shall select a committee to advise & consult with the Board of Trustees, & appropriate members thereof in the selection of a President. The President shall be appointed with, and continue to have, the confidence of the Faculty Assembly.

[The President shall not be appointed without the consent of the Faculty Assembly. He shall continue

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

to serve only so long as he has the confidence
of the Faculty Assembly.